Exhibit 14

Neil Trantum Vol. 1	
07/13/2010	

Case 1:05-cv-04622-DLI-RML Document 396-14 Filed 05/23/18 Page 3 of 4 PageID #: 17556 Trantum, Neil Vol. 1 07/13/2010

Page 1	Page 3
1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	1
2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	2 Also Present:
Z EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
3 Action No: 05cv4622(DGT)(MDG)	3 EXAMINER: ADRIAN HUGHES
4	4 COURT REPORTER:
5 TZVI WEISS, et al,	COURT REPORTER: 5
Plaintiffs, 6 against	AILSA WILLIAMS 6 European Deposition Services
	59 Chesson Rd
7 NATIONAL WESTMINSTER BANK, PLC., Defendant.	7 London, W14 9QS
8	8 Telephone: 44 (020) 7385 0077
9 NATAN APPLEBAUM, et al.,	9 VIDEOGRAPHER: DAVID ROSS
10 Plaintiffs,	10
11 against	11
12 NATIONAL WESTMINSTER BANK, PLC.,	12
13 Defendant.	13
14	14
15	15
16 VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF NEIL TRANTUM	16
17 Tuesday 13 July 2010	17
18 At: 10:00 am	18
19 Taken at:	19
20 Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton LLP	20
55 Basinghall Street, London	
21 United Kingdom	21
22	22
23	23
24	24
25	25
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL 2	
Page 2	Page 4
Page 2 1 APPEARANCES	Page 4 1
	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 APPEARANCES 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ.	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 APPEARANCES 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 For Plaintiff Tzvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528	1
1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 For Plaintiff Txvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum:	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Switt 6 Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERENER Sayles 6 Werbner	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERENER Sayles & Werbner 8 4400 Renaissance Tower	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Switt & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERENER Sayles & Werbner 8 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. 9 Dallas, Texas 75270	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 APPEARANCES 2 For Plaintiff Tzvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 Cne South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Fhiladelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERENER Sayles & Werbner 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St.	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 APPEARANCES 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Switt & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERBNER Sayles & Werbner 8 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. 9 Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 APPEARANCES 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERENER Sayles & Werbner 8 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. 9 Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763 10 11 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss:	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 APPEARANCES 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pensylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERENER Sayles & Wertner 8 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. 9 Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763 10 11 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 12 AITAN GOELMAN Zuckerman Spaeder LLP	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ.	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERENER Sayles & Werbner 8 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. 9 Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763 10 11 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 12 AITAN GOELMAN Zuckerman Spaeder LLP	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Switt & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERENER Sayles & Wertner 8 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763 10 11 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 12 ATTAN GOELMAN ZUCKETMAN Spaeder LLP 13 1800 M Street, NW, Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20036-5807	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ.	1 NEIL TRANTUM
Por Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Switt & Graf PC One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 Tel: 419 246 0528 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: MARK WERENER Sayles & Wertner 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: ATTAN GOELMAN Zuckerman Spaeder LLP 1800 M Street, NW, Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20036-5807 Tel: 202 778 1996 For the Plaintiffs: For the Plaintiffs:	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERENER Sayles & Werbner 8 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. 9 Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763 10 11 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 12 AITAN GOELMAN Zuckerman Spacer LLP 13 1800 M Street, NM, Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20036-5807 14 Tel: 202 778 1996 15 For the Plaintiffs: 16 STEPHEN LOBEL and HANNAH GRAV 17 Finers, Stephens & Innocent LLP	1 NEIL TRANTUM
Por Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Switt & Graf PC One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 Tel: 419 246 0528 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: MARK WERENER Sayles & Wertner 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: ATTAN GOELMAN Zuckerman Spaeder LLP 1800 M Street, NW, Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20036-5807 Tel: 202 778 1996 For the Plaintiffs: For the Plaintiffs:	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERENER Sayles & Werbner 8 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. 9 Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763 10 11 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 12 AITAN GOELMAN Zuckerman Spaech MI, Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20036-5807 14 Tel: 202 778 1996 15 For the Plaintiffs: 16 STEPHEN LOBEL and HANNAH GRAV 17 Finers, Stephens & Innocent LLP 18 For Defendant National Westminster Bank, PLC:	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERENER Sayles & Werbner 8 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. 9 Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763 10 11 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 12 AITAN GOELMAN Zuckerman Spaeder LLP 13 1800 M Street, NM, Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20036-5807 Tel: 202 778 1996 15 For the Plaintiffs: 16 STEPHEN LOBEL and HANNAH GRAV 17 Finers, Stephens & Innocent LLP 18 For Defendant National Westminster Bank, PLC: 19 JONATHAN I. BLACKMAN ESQ. and SUE. H. RHEE Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton LLP	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERENER Sayles & Werbner 8 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. 9 Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763 10 11 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 12 AITAN COELMAN Zuckerman Spaeder LLP 13 1800 M Street, NM, Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20036-5807 14 Tel: 202 778 1996 15 For the Plaintiffs: 16 STEPHEN LOBEL and HANNAH GRAV 17 Finers, Stephens & Innocent LLP 18 For Defendant National Westminster Bank, PLC: 19 JONATRAN I. BLACKMAN ESQ. and SUE. H. RHEE Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton LLP One Liberty Plaza	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 APPEARANCES 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERENER Sayles & Werbner 8 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. 9 Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763 10 11 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 12 AITAN GOELMAN Zuckerman Spacedr LLP 13 1800 M Street, NM, Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20036-5807 14 Tel: 202 778 1996 15 For the Plaintiffs: 16 STEPHEN LOBEL and HANNAH GRAV 17 Finers, Stephens & Innocent LLP 18 For Defendant National Westminster Bank, PLC: 19 JONATHAN I. BLACKMAN ESQ. and SUE. H. RHEE Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton LLP One Liberty Plaza New York, NY 10006-1470 Tel: 212 225 2000	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 APPEARANCES 2 FOR Plaintiff Tzvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 FOR Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERENER Sayles & Werther 8 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. 9 Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763 10 11 FOR Plaintiff Tzvi Weiss: 12 AITAN GOELMAN Zuckerman Spaeder LLP 13 1800 M Street, NM, Swite 1000 Mashington, DC 20036-5807 Tel: 202 778 1996 15 FOR the Plaintiffs: 16 STEPHEN LOBEL and HANNAH GRAV 17 Finers, Stephens & Innocent LLP 18 FOR Defendant National Westminster Bank, PLC: 19 JONATHAN I. BLACKMAN ESQ. and SUE. H. RHEE Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton LLP Cne Liberty Plaza New York, NY 10006-1470	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 APPEARANCES 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERENER Sayles & Werbner 8 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. 9 Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763 10 11 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 12 AITAN GOELMAN Zuckerman Spacedr LLP 13 1800 M Street, NM, Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20036-5807 14 Tel: 202 778 1996 15 For the Plaintiffs: 16 STEPHEN LOBEL and HANNAH GRAV 17 Finers, Stephens & Innocent LLP 18 For Defendant National Westminster Bank, PLC: 19 JONATHAN I. BLACKMAN ESQ. and SUE. H. RHEE Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton LLP One Liberty Plaza New York, NY 10006-1470 Tel: 212 225 2000	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 APPEARANCES 2 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 Cne South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERENER Sayles & Werbner 8 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. 9 Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763 10 11 For Plaintiff Trvi Weiss: 12 AITAN GOELMAN Zuckerman Spaeder LLP 13 1800 M Street, NM, Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20036-5807 Tel: 20 778 1996 15 For the Plaintiffs: 16 STEPHEN LOBEL and HANNAH GRAV 17 Finers, Stephens & Innocent LLP 18 For Defendant National Westminster Bank, PLC: 19 JONNTHAN I. BLACKSGAN ESQ. and SUE. H. RHEE 20 Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton LLP 21 New York, NY 10006-1470 Tel: 212 225 2000 22	1 NEIL TRANTUM
Por Plaintiff Tzvi Weiss: STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC Gne South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 Tel: 419 246 0528 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: MARK WERBNER Sayles & Werbner 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763 For Plaintiff Tzvi Weiss: AITAN GOELMAN Zuckerman Spaeder LLP 18 1800 M Street, NW, Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20036-5807 Tel: 202 778 1996 For the Plaintiffs: STEPHEN LOBEL and HANNAH GRAV Finers, Stephens & Innocent LLP For Defendant National Westminster Bank, FLC: JONATHAN I. BLACKMAN ESQ. and SUE, H. RHEE Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton LLP Che Liberty Plaza New York, NY 1006-1470 Tel: 212 225 2000	1 NEIL TRANTUM
1 APPEARANCES 2 For Plaintiff Tzvi Weiss: 3 STEPHEN SCHMART2, ESQ. Kohn, Swift & Graf PC 4 One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3304 5 Tel: 419 246 0528 6 For Plaintiff Natan Applebaum: 7 MARK WERBNER Sayles & Werbner 8 4400 Renaissance Tower 1201 Elm St. 9 Dallas, Texas 75270 Tel: 214 939 8763 10 11 For Plaintiff Tzvi Weiss: 12 AITAN GOELMAN Zuckerman Spæder LLP 13 1800 M Street, NW, Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20036-5807 14 Tel: 202 778 1996 15 For the Plaintiffs: 16 STEPHEN LOBEL and HANNAH GRAV 17 Finers, Stephens & Innocent LLP 18 For Defendant National Westminster Bank, PLC: 19 JONATHAN I. BLACKMAN ESQ. and SUE. H. RHEE Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton LLP One Liberty Plaza 21 New York, NY 10006-1470 Tel: 212 225 2000	1 NEIL TRANTUM

Page 141	Page 143
1 MR. BLACKMAN: Objection, form of the	1) would not want to be involved in it, ethically or
2 question. Vague as to what "legitimate" means. You can	2 reputationally.
3 answer.	3 Q. Okay. So in addition to you would not
4 A. The reputational risk would be more about	4 have done it, you also don't ever remember it being
5 if you left it open; that would be the more likely	5 questioned in a terrorist financing case where I am
6 reputational risk you would be concerned about.	6 sorry, I have to finish my question in a case where
7 Q. This says "the reputational risk of	7 there is potential terrorist financing, you never
8 closure"?	8 remember there being an issue of what are the
9 A. This is very unusual. I was not aware of	9 reputational risks of closure?
10 this, but the fact is that I am not aware of this coming	10 MR. BLACKMAN: Object to the form of the
11 up hardly at all.	11 question because you stuck in, quite deliberately, the
12 Q. So in your experience reputational risk	12 word "potential". The witness' testimony was about
13 militates in favor of closure, not in favor of keeping	13 knowing about terror financing. You have now switched
14 an account open?	14 it to "potential", and that is a very different thing,
15 A. What I am saying is when you are	15 as you well know. So I object to the form of the
16 considering whether to close an account, the	16 question, it lacks foundation, it is deliberately
17 reputational risk is normally around keeping it open,	17 misleading. You may answer.
18 not what is the reputational risk if you close it.	18 A. I think Mr. Blackman made the point I was
19 There are some instances where that happens, like	19 going to make. If you have got a higher degree of
20 Huntington Life Sciences, for instance, whichever way	20 suspicion that it is close to being more positive, then
21 you go you have got a reputational risk.	21 you would not want to be involved. Where your suspicion
22 Q. What is Huntingdon Life Sciences?	22 is very tenuous, then it is more difficult.
23 A. Knew you were going to ask that.	23 Q. Okay. Well, is it a legitimate concern
24 Q. Sorry.	24 is reputational risk of closure a legitimate concern if
25 A. They do experiments on animals.	25 your suspicion is tenuous, as opposed to a higher degree
Page 142	Paris 144
Page 142	Page 144
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue?	1 of certainty?
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open	1 of certainty? 2 A. I want to make sure I have got that the
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got	of certainty? A. I want to make sure I have got that the right way, what you are asking me.
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open	1 of certainty? 2 A. I want to make sure I have got that the
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas,	of certainty? A. I want to make sure I have got that the right way, what you are asking me. Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said:
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything	of certainty? A. I want to make sure I have got that the right way, what you are asking me. Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right,	of certainty? A. I want to make sure I have got that the right way, what you are asking me. Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said:
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything	of certainty? A. I want to make sure I have got that the right way, what you are asking me. Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right,	of certainty? A. I want to make sure I have got that the right way, what you are asking me. Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is close to being more positive, then you would not want to
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, 8 and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't	of certainty? A. I want to make sure I have got that the right way, what you are asking me. Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is close to being more positive, then you would not want to be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, 8 and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't 9 want to bank with you." You cannot win whichever way	1 of certainty? 2 A. I want to make sure I have got that the 3 right way, what you are asking me. 4 Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. 5 Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: 6 "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is 7 close to being more positive, then you would not want to 8 be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then 9 it is more difficult". That is what you just testified
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, 8 and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't 9 want to bank with you." You cannot win whichever way 10 you go, unless you have got, you know, a policy that you	1 of certainty? 2 A. I want to make sure I have got that the 3 right way, what you are asking me. 4 Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. 5 Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: 6 "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is 7 close to being more positive, then you would not want to 8 be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then 9 it is more difficult". That is what you just testified 10 to. My question is, is reputational risk of closing the
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, 8 and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't 9 want to bank with you." You cannot win whichever way 10 you go, unless you have got, you know, a policy that you 11 are public about.	1 of certainty? 2 A. I want to make sure I have got that the 3 right way, what you are asking me. 4 Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. 5 Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: 6 "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is 7 close to being more positive, then you would not want to 8 be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then 9 it is more difficult". That is what you just testified 10 to. My question is, is reputational risk of closing the 11 account and being accused of some kind of bias, is that
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, 8 and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't 9 want to bank with you." You cannot win whichever way 10 you go, unless you have got, you know, a policy that you 11 are public about. 12 Q. So in terms of terror financing, were you	1 of certainty? 2 A. I want to make sure I have got that the 3 right way, what you are asking me. 4 Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. 5 Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: 6 "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is 7 close to being more positive, then you would not want to 8 be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then 9 it is more difficult". That is what you just testified 10 to. My question is, is reputational risk of closing the 11 account and being accused of some kind of bias, is that 12 a legitimate concern in the second of those two
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, 8 and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't 9 want to bank with you." You cannot win whichever way 10 you go, unless you have got, you know, a policy that you 11 are public about. 12 Q. So in terms of terror financing, were you 13 ever part of or ever aware of any discussions in the	1 of certainty? 2 A. I want to make sure I have got that the 3 right way, what you are asking me. 4 Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. 5 Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: 6 "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is 7 close to being more positive, then you would not want to 8 be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then 9 it is more difficult". That is what you just testified 10 to. My question is, is reputational risk of closing the 11 account and being accused of some kind of bias, is that 12 a legitimate concern in the second of those two 13 categories, where it is more tenuous?
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, 8 and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't 9 want to bank with you." You cannot win whichever way 10 you go, unless you have got, you know, a policy that you 11 are public about. 12 Q. So in terms of terror financing, were you 13 ever part of or ever aware of any discussions in the 14 bank about a reputational risk of "If we close this	1 of certainty? 2 A. I want to make sure I have got that the 3 right way, what you are asking me. 4 Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. 5 Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: 6 "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is 7 close to being more positive, then you would not want to 8 be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then 9 it is more difficult". That is what you just testified 10 to. My question is, is reputational risk of closing the 11 account and being accused of some kind of bias, is that 12 a legitimate concern in the second of those two 13 categories, where it is more tenuous? 14 A. It may be, given certain factors. You
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, 8 and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't 9 want to bank with you." You cannot win whichever way 10 you go, unless you have got, you know, a policy that you 11 are public about. 12 (1) So in terms of terror financing, were you 13 ewer part of or ever aware of any discussions in the 14 bank about a reputational risk of "If we close this" 15 account because of potential terrorist financing we	1 of certainty? 2 A. I want to make sure I have got that the 3 right way, what you are asking me. 4 Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. 5 Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: 6 "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is 7 close to being more positive, then you would not want to 8 be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then 9 it is more difficult". That is what you just testified 10 to. My question is, is reputational risk of closing the 11 account and being accused of some kind of bias, is that 12 a legitimate concern in the second of those two 13 categories, where it is more tenuous? 14 A. It may be, given certain factors. You 15 know, I think you would have to look at it on a case by
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, 8 and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't 9 want to bank with you." You cannot win whichever way 10 you go, unless you have got, you know, a policy that you 11 are public about. 12 () So in terms of terror financing, were you 13 ever part of or ever aware of any discussions in the 14 bank about a reputational risk of "If we close this 15 account because of potential terrorist financing we 16 could be risking reputational damage"3	A. I want to make sure I have got that the iright way, what you are asking me. Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is close to being more positive, then you would not want to be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then it is more difficult". That is what you just testified to. My question is, is reputational risk of closing the account and being accused of some kind of bias, is that a legitimate concern in the second of those two categories, where it is more tenuous? A. It may be, given certain factors. You know, I think you would have to look at it on a case by case basis. What I don't want to do is make
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, 8 and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't 9 want to bank with you." You cannot win whichever way 10 you go, unless you have got, you know, a policy that you 11 are public about. 12 Q. So in terms of terror financing, were you 13 ever part of or ever aware of any discussions in the 14 bank about a reputational risk of "If we close this 15 account because of potential terrorist financing we 16 could be risking reputational damage"? 17 A. To be really clear here, we would never	1 of certainty? 2 A. I want to make sure I have got that the 3 right way, what you are asking me. 4 Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. 5 Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: 6 "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is 7 close to being more positive, then you would not want to 8 be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then 9 it is more difficult". That is what you just testified 10 to. My question is, is reputational risk of closing the 11 account and being accused of some kind of bias, is that 12 a legitimate concern in the second of those two 13 categories, where it is more tenuous? 14 A. It may be, given certain factors. You 15 know, I think you would have to look at it on a case by 16 case basis. What I don't want to do is make 17 a generalization here. Because these type of things can
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, 8 and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't 9 want to bank with you." You cannot win whichever way 10 you go, unless you have got, you know, a policy that you 11 are public about. 12 Q. So in terms of terror financing, were you 13 ever part of or ever aware of any discussions in the 14 bank about a reputational risk of "If we close this 15 account because of potential terrorist financing we 16 could be risking reputational damage"? 17 A.) To be really clear here, we would never 18 have had that discussion. If we thought terrorist	A. I want to make sure I have got that the right way, what you are asking me. Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is close to being more positive, then you would not want to be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then it is more difficult". That is what you just testified to. My question is, is reputational risk of closing the account and being accused of some kind of bias, is that a legitimate concern in the second of those two categories, where it is more tenuous? A. It may be, given certain factors. You know, I think you would have to look at it on a case by case basis. What I don't want to do is make a generalization here. Because these type of things can be very different, one case to another, so I think you
A. Yes. So if you keep the account open because they are not doing anything wrong, you have gct all the demonstrators trying to get other people to boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, if you close it, the customer has not done anything wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't want to bank with you." You cannot win whichever way you go, unless you have got, you know, a policy that you are public about. Q. So in terms of terror financing, were you were part of or ever awars of any discussions in the bank about a reputational risk of "If we close this account because of potential terrorist financing we could be risking reputational damage"? A. To be really clear here, we would never tinance was going on, it would have just been closed. It would not have been: "Let's have a think about what	A. I want to make sure I have got that the right way, what you are asking me. Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is close to being more positive, then you would not want to be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then it is more difficult". That is what you just testified to. My question is, is reputational risk of closing the account and being accused of some kind of bias, is that a legitimate concern in the second of those two categories, where it is more tenuous? A. It may be, given certain factors. You know, I think you would have to look at it on a case by case basis. What I don't want to do is make a generalization here. Because these type of things can be very different, one case to another, so I think you would have to look at the case on its merits, the risks involved.
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, 8 and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't 9 want to bank with you." You cannot win whichever way 10 you go, unless you have got, you know, a policy that you 11 are public about. 12 Q. So in terms of terror financing, were you 13 ever part of or ever aware of any discussions in the 14 bank about a reputational risk of "If we close this 15 account because of potential terrorist financing we 16 could be risking reputational damage"? 17 A. To be really clear here, we would never 18 have had that discussion.) If we thought terrorist 19 (finance was going on, it would have just been closed. 20 (It would not have been: "Let's have a think about what) 21 (the risks are from a reputational point of view.")	A. I want to make sure I have got that the right way, what you are asking me. Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is close to being more positive, then you would not want to be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then it is more difficult". That is what you just testified to. My question is, is reputational risk of closing the account and being accused of some kind of bias, is that a legitimate concern in the second of those two categories, where it is more tenuous? A. It may be, given certain factors. You know, I think you would have to look at it on a case by case basis. What I don't want to do is make a generalization here. Because these type of things can be very different, one case to another, so I think you would have to look at the case on its merits, the risks involved. Q. Let me move away from the "would"
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, 8 and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't 9 want to bank with you." You cannot win whichever way 10 you go, unless you have got, you know, a policy that you 11 are public about. 12 Q. So in terms of terror financing, were you 13 ever part of or ever aware of any discussions in the 14 bank about a reputational risk of "If we close this 15 account because of potential terrorist financing we 16 could be risking reputational damage"? 17 A.) To be resily clear here, we would never 18 have had that discussion. If we thought terrorist 19 finance was going on, it would have just been closed. 20 It would not have been: "Let's have a think about what" 21 the risks are from a reputational point of view."	A. I want to make sure I have got that the right way, what you are asking me. Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is close to being more positive, then you would not want to be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then it is more difficult". That is what you just testified to. My question is, is reputational risk of closing the account and being accused of some kind of bias, is that a legitimate concern in the second of those two categories, where it is more tenuous? A. It may be, given certain factors. You know, I think you would have to look at it on a case by case basis. What I don't want to do is make a generalization here. Because these type of things can be very different, one case to another, so I think you would have to look at the case on its merits, the risks involved. Q. Let me move away from the "would" question. And I think you may have kind of answered
A. Yes. So if you keep the account open because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got all the demonstrators trying to get other people to boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, if you close it, the customer has not done anything wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't want to bank with you." You cannot win whichever way you go, unless you have got, you know, a policy that you are public about. 'Q' Go in terms of terror financing, were you were part of or ever aware of any discussions in the bank about a reputational risk of "If we close this account because of potential terrorist financing we could be risking reputational damage"? 'A. To be really clear here, we would never have had that discussion.' If we thought terrorist finance was going on, it would have just been closed. 'Ct would not have been: "Let's have a think about what' the risks are from a reputational point of view." 'Because, you know, the terrorist finance,	A. I want to make sure I have got that the right way, what you are asking me. Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is close to being more positive, then you would not want to be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then it is more difficult". That is what you just testified to. My question is, is reputational risk of closing the account and being accused of some kind of bias, is that a legitimate concern in the second of those two categories, where it is more tenuous? A. It may be, given certain factors. You know, I think you would have to look at it on a case by case basis. What I don't want to do is make a generalization here. Because these type of things can be very different, one case to another, so I think you would have to look at the case on its merits, the risks involved. Q. Let me move away from the "would" question. And I think you may have kind of answered this. I just want to get a kind of clear answer.
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, 8 and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't 9 want to bank with you." You cannot win whichever way 10 you go, unless you have got, you know, a policy that you 11 are public about. 12 Q. So in terms of terror financing, were you 13 ever part of or ever aware of any discussions in the 14 bank about a reputational risk of "If we close this 15 account because of potential terrorist financing we 16 could be risking reputational damage"? 17 A. To be really clear here, we would never 18 have had that discussion. If we thought terrorist 19 finance was going on, it would have just been closed. 10 It would not have been: "Let's have a think about what 11 the risks are from a reputational point of view." 12 Q. Why is that? 13 Because, you know, the terrorist finance, 14 you cannot be doing it anyway, knowingly, and the risks	A. I want to make sure I have got that the right way, what you are asking me. Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is close to being more positive, then you would not want to be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then it is more difficult". That is what you just testified to. My question is, is reputational risk of closing the account and being accused of some kind of bias, is that a legitimate concern in the second of those two categories, where it is more tenuous? A. It may be, given certain factors. You know, I think you would have to look at it on a case by case basis. What I don't want to do is make a generalization here. Because these type of things can be very different, one case to another, so I think you would have to look at the case on its merits, the risks involved. Q. Let me move away from the "would" question. And I think you may have kind of answered this. I just want to get a kind of clear answer. During your tenure at the bank, whether it was called
1 Q. It is an animal cruelty issue? 2 A. Yes. So if you keep the account open 3 because they are not doing anything wrong, you have got 4 all the demonstrators trying to get other people to 5 boycott banking with you, et cetera, et cetera, whereas, 6 if you close it, the customer has not done anything 7 wrong, he is within the law, but is it ethically right, 8 and a whole bunch of other customers saying: "We don't 9 want to bank with you." You cannot win whichever way 10 you go, unless you have got, you know, a policy that you 11 are public about. 12 (1) So in terms of terror financing, were you 13 ever part of or ever aware of any discussions in the 14 bank about a reputational risk of "If we close this 15 account because of potential terrorist financing we 16 could be risking reputational damage"? 17 (a) To be really clear here, we would never 18 have had that discussion. If we thought terrorist 19 finance was going on, it would have just been closed. 20 (It would not have been: "Let's have a think about what") 21 the risks are from a reputational point of view." 22 (2) Why is that? 23 (3) Secause, you know, the terrorist finance,	A. I want to make sure I have got that the right way, what you are asking me. Q. You distinguished between I think Mr. Blackman made the point I was going to make. You said: "If you have got a higher degree of suspicion that is close to being more positive, then you would not want to be involved. Where your suspicion is very tenuous, then it is more difficult". That is what you just testified to. My question is, is reputational risk of closing the account and being accused of some kind of bias, is that a legitimate concern in the second of those two categories, where it is more tenuous? A. It may be, given certain factors. You know, I think you would have to look at it on a case by case basis. What I don't want to do is make a generalization here. Because these type of things can be very different, one case to another, so I think you would have to look at the case on its merits, the risks involved. Q. Let me move away from the "would" question. And I think you may have kind of answered this. I just want to get a kind of clear answer.